

EXHIBIT B

Historically

THE TRUTH ABOUT FRIVOLOUS TA ARGUMENTS

January 1, 2010

I. FRIVOLOUS TA ARGUMENTS IN GENERAL	1
A. <i>The Voluntary Nature of the Federal Income Tax System</i>	1
1. Contention <i>The filing of a tax return is voluntary</i>	1
2. Contention <i>Payment of tax is voluntary</i>	3
3. Contention <i>Taxpayers can reduce their federal income tax liability by filing a "zero return."</i>	7
4. Contention <i>The IRS must prepare federal tax returns for a person who fails to file.</i>	9
5. Contention <i>Compliance with an administrative summons issued by the IRS is voluntary</i>	10
B. <i>The Meaning of Income Taxable Income and Gross Income</i>	12
1. Contention <i>Wages, tips, and other compensation received for personal services are not income</i>	12
2. Contention <i>Only foreign-source income is taxable</i>	18
3. Contention <i>Federal Reserve Notes are not income</i>	20
C. <i>The Meaning of Certain Terms Used in the Internal Revenue Code</i>	21
1. Contention <i>Taxpayer is not a "citizen" of the United States, thus not subject to the federal income tax laws</i>	21
2. Contention <i>The "United States" consists only of the District of Columbia, federal territories, and federal enclaves</i>	24
3. Contention <i>Taxpayer is not a "person" as defined by the Internal Revenue Code, thus is not subject to the federal income tax laws</i>	26
4. Contention <i>The only "employees" subject to federal income tax are employees of the federal government</i>	27
D. <i>Constitutional Amendment Claims</i>	29
1. Contention <i>Taxpayers can refuse to pay income taxes on religious or moral grounds by invoking the First Amendment</i>	29
2. Contention <i>Federal income taxes constitute a "taking" of property without due process of law, violating the Fifth Amendment</i>	30
3. Contention <i>Taxpayers do not have to file returns or provide financial information because of the protection against self-incrimination found in the Fifth Amendment</i>	31
4. Contention <i>Compelled compliance with the federal income tax laws is a form of servitude in violation of the Thirteenth Amendment</i>	33
5. Contention <i>The Sixteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution was not properly ratified, thus the federal income tax laws are unconstitutional</i>	34
6. Contention <i>The Sixteenth Amendment does not authorize a direct non-apportioned federal income tax on United States citizens</i>	36
E. <i>Fictional Legal Bases</i>	38

United States v. Collins, 920 F.2d 619, 629 (10th Cir. 1990), cert. denied, 500 U.S. 950 (1991) the court found defendant's argument that the Sixteenth Amendment does not authorize a direct, non-apportioned tax on United States citizens similarly to be 'devoid of any arguable basis in law.'

In re Becraft, 885 F.2d 547 (9th Cir. 1989) the court affirmed a failure to file conviction, rejecting the taxpayer's frivolous position that the Sixteenth Amendment does not authorize a direct non-apportioned income tax.

Lovell v. United States, 755 F.2d 517, 518 (7th Cir. 1984) the court rejected the argument that the Constitution prohibits imposition of a direct tax without apportionment, and upheld the district court's frivolous return penalty assessment and the award of attorneys' fees to the government 'because the taxpayers' legal position was patently frivolous.' The appeals court imposed additional sanctions for pursuing 'frivolous arguments in bad faith.'

Broughton v. United States, 632 F.2d 706 (8th Cir. 1980), cert. denied, 450 U.S. 930 (1981) the court rejected a refund suit, stating that the Sixteenth Amendment authorizes imposition of an income tax without apportionment among the states.

United States v. Hockensmith, 104 A.F.T.R.2d 2009-5133, 2009 WL 1883521 (M.D. Pa. Jun. 30, 2009) the court rejected the taxpayer's arguments that no law created an income tax and that the taxpayer was outside the government's taxing authority. The court held that the Sixteenth Amendment allows for the taxation of income and eliminates the requirement for apportionment among the states.

Maxwell v. Internal Revenue Service, 2009 WL 920533, 103 A.F.T.R.2d 2009-1571 (M.D. Tenn. Apr. 1, 2009) the court found that the taxpayer's arguments to have been 'routinely rejected,' principally that there is no law that imposes an income tax nor is there a non-apportioned direct tax that could be imposed on him as a supposed non-citizen.

Stearman v. Commissioner, T.C. Memo. 2005-39, 89 T.C.M. (CCH) 823 (2005), aff'd, 436 F.3d 533 (5th Cir. 2006), cert. denied, 547 U.S. 1207 (2006) the court imposed sanctions totaling 25,000 against the taxpayer for advancing arguments characteristic of tax-protester rhetoric that has been universally rejected by the courts, including arguments regarding the Sixteenth Amendment. In affirming the Tax Court's holding, the Fifth Circuit granted the government's request for further sanctions of 6,000 against the taxpayer for maintaining frivolous arguments on appeal, and the Fifth Circuit imposed an additional 6,000 sanctions on its own, for total additional sanctions of 12,000.

